



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,854	07/10/2003	Latasha E. Lewis	44099-182055	9998
23973	7590	11/15/2004	EXAMINER	
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH ONE LOGAN SQUARE 18TH AND CHERRY STREETS PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996			PATEL, TAJASH D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3765	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,854	LEWIS, LATASHA E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tejash D Patel	3765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/3/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost (US 5,180,165). Frost discloses a hand protection device (20) including a gripping portion having first and second gripping surfaces (36,38) and a flange portion (34) that is substantially normal to the gripping portion and covers the upper extremity of the hand as shown in figures 1 and 4. In addition, the flange portion of the hand device is made of a hard portion (40), col. 3, lines 38-45 and as shown in figure 2. Also, the first gripping surface engages the hand while the second gripping surface engages an object (32) grasped by the device. Frost discloses the invention as set forth above except for showing the flange portion being substantially resistant to penetration by sharp implements.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the hand device of Frost having a flange portion being made of a hard material can be substantially resistant to penetration by sharp implements or depending on the end use thereof.

With regard to claims 2 and 8, col. 3, lines 41-46 of Frost states that the device can be made of "all hard material, such as metal, hard plastics or of a somewhat flexible material such as soft rubber, soft plastic or the like". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to recognize that the hand device of Frost having first and second gripping surfaces can be textured in order to provide and increase gripping surface area or depending on the end use thereof.

3. Claims 3-4, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frost as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of McHugh (US 5,806,091). Frost discloses the invention as set forth above except for showing the hand protector having at least one finger loop/pocket.

McHugh discloses a hand protector having first and second gripping surfaces with at least one finger loop/pocket (26) as shown in figure 2A.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the hand protector of Frost with at least one finger loop/pocket as taught by McHugh in order to maintain the device relative to the hand while the second surface engages a grasped object.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tejash Patel whose telephone number is (703) 306-9184. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.



TEJASH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

November 3, 2004